Table C Task Force Survey Result

		Question Number																		
No	**Date**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8a**	**8b**	**8c**	**9a**	**9b**	**9c**	**9d**	**10**	**11**	**12**	**Concerns**	**Comments**	**Lo**
1	5/17/00	2	4	4	2	2	1	1	4	3	2	4	4	2	4	3	3	1			HQ
2	5/17/00	2	3	3	3	1	1	2	3	2	4	3	3	3	3	4	4	1	In the new program we should be able to plug in a location and run it for the ten recent years and have all quarters that the location hits on come up; also showing the segments for those quarters associated with the requested location.	I would like the Table C twice a year (Jan/July) or (mar/Oct)	08
3	5/17/00	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	4	2	3	2	4	4	4	3	3	1	Although one of the more useful tool for advising of problematic portions of a highway this system has some shortcomings related to criteria used to compare similar roadways and some serious ADT deficiencies at intersections. Additionally, in areas where recreational traffic peaks and ebbs with the seasons, the rates become over averaged and thus do not present a true comparison with" statewide averages". Congestion related occurrences should be flagged as should recurrent collision types. While the0.2 mile segments are useful in identifying spot locations, perhaps a corridor approach may just be more enlightening from an overall viewpoint. EG. perhaps a concentration of collisions is due to an influence outside the 0.2 criteria. Rate groups appear to be somewhat mystifying and seemingly defy definition. Facilities of similar type????? who defines?? what are criteria?? Strongly feel that our present system is a very effective way of addressing needs, however, we can always improve and make it better.	Recently transferred from 09 to 05 I am not totally familiar with local experience and thus my input is based on 09 observations. Have found hat without exception, traffic counts at local road intersections are mostly ignored or misrepresented which does influence Table C calculations. Recreational Traffic also has unpredictable peaks and ADTs swell and ebb seasonally disproportionately which compromises direct comparisons as to similar types of facilities.	05
4	5/17/00	4	1	3	1	1	1	2	5	4	1	3	3	1	3	4	2	3	Local street traffic volumes need to be updated.		04
5	5/17/00	3	5	5	4	1	1	2	4	4	2	3	3	3	3	4	4	2	I'd like to see a listing including ONLY required locations. I'd like the output (Table B) to accurately provide the actual and average rates in a useable format...no converting data for segments less than .5 mile long. We shouldn't be receiving required locations in Table C that have met the criteria (investigated previously in the last 12 months) for not having to be reinvestigated.	Since the Table C program monitors all HT65's, when will we be able to eliminate quarterly reports? It seems rather duplicative as it stands today.	01
6	5/17/00	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	5	1	5	5	5	1	5	5	2	The Table C needs to be send out on time. Early as possible so we can start to work on them and catch problems early on our Highway System.		11
7	5/17/00	1	5	5	5	1	1	1	2	5	1	1	5	5	2	4	4	4	To assist in prioritizing safety investigations, one mechanism is to compare the 'actual' collision rate vs. statewide average (after conversion). Can this conversion equation be installed into TASAS so that the 'actual' collision rate has already been converted (for segments <= to 0.5 mi.) and we are comparing 'apples with apples' in the Table C listings?? Is 99.5% confidence level necessary?? Could we be missing locations at this high level of confidence?? Is 95%-97.5% more realistic for our purposes??...just a question.		01
8	5/17/00	2	2	2	3	1	1	1	3	5	1	3	1	2	3	2	1	1			04
9	5/17/00	4	1	3	2	3	2	3	5	3	2	4	5	5	2	5	5	2			12
10	5/17/00	3	5	5	5	1	3	2	5	4	1	1	1	5	4	5	5	4	I have to use TASAS in the various project reports that I write. These reports are supposed to be metric. TASAS still uses the English system of measurements. I suggest that TASAS be converted to the metric system	I don't run the Table Cs. I just initiate the projects that come from this data base.	03
11	5/17/00	2	2	4	2	4	4	2	2	2	4	2	2	4	2	4	2	4	- investigators should be able to download this info from Ct system - should have the choices to obtain table c in graphic/chart format or the usual list format - should be able to list table c by counties - wet table c should indicate most recent skid no. for the segment - should be able to ue this and analyse using Arc View GIS	who are these people and by what criteria are they included in the taks force?	04
12	5/17/00	1	4	4	5	2	1	1	5	4	2	4	5	5	2	5	5	3	Would it be possible to show distance from Cl for objects which are hit and listed on the Table B printouts, (V1, Tree, Dike, MBGR, etc...)?		02
13	5/18/00	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	5	4	3	3	3	2	3	3	2			04
14	5/18/00	1	3	3	3	2	2	4	4	5	1	4	4	1	4	2	2	4			11
15	5/18/00	3	1	2	3	1	1	2	5	2	4	3	3	2	3	5	2	2		It seems to me that the TAB C may be too sensitive for urbanized areas and the threshold of what is considered "High Accident" should be raised. A 200K ADT driver is different than a 20K ADT driver even with an ADT correction. My experience is that most freeway TAB C's result in no action, but require quite a bit of work. The freeways are pretty much standardized (Unless Consultants Designed Them) and finding any major safety faults is not normally possible. Mostly improvements are of a CURE nature and the State should not expose themselves to the Tort position of declaring a location a "High Accident" location when high volumes and driver errors are the predoment cause of the Axs. The efforts should go into conventional and intersection	12

																			required reviews as these may have room for improvement. Also the statewide averaging should be changed to be more localized. So Cal is different that the Central Valley, desert or	
16	5/18/00	1	3	3	2	3	3	2	5	3	2	3	3	5	1	4	3	3	The significance criteria should incorporate ADT or some measurement of volume.	02
17	5/18/00	5	1	4	5	1	2	1	5	4	2	5	5	5	1	5	5	3	Eliminate the Table C WET. Let us decide if a location needs a wet review. For example, we don't have Table C DARK, Table C WIND, Table C FOG etc.. We should only have standard Table C investigations, and leave the decisions up to us. Many Table C WET's don't need a wet review or any special wet consideration. Example, all pavements have less traction when wet. This leads to more wet accidents. But, there is no ponding or unusual flow of water on the pavement. Also, many of my locations have 15, 20, 30 or more accidents in a 2/10 mile segment. Usually, 3 or more of the accidents are wet, but this location doesn't need a wet review, just a standard review. Chain reaction accidents currently are listed as seperate accidents. Any two, three or more accidents that occure within a1/2 hour time period, on the same date, should be counted as one accident. Then, some table C required locatons would not trigger. It would save us time and lower our work loads because these locations are almost always "No Action". I would also like to have the number of accidents changed from 4 or more accidents in either the 3,6, or 12 months, to 5 or more. This change will reflect the reality of poor driving, speeding, impaired driving, etc. that is common now on our highways. Everything else about the TASAS system is working well. It's a truely effective analysis system. Todd Niles District 5 Traffic Safety field investigator 831-783-3028	Automated collision diagrams would go a long way into getting necessary information to other engineers at Caltrans, and this would improve safety. Manually drawning collision diagrams is tedious and time consuming, therefore, many collison diagrams are not drawn. A computer program could easially draw these diagrams. Many cities, like Watsonville, currently have automated collision diagrams that can be pulled up by computer. Programs are already available. We should be using them. The first question in this survey, about "not analyzed segments" is not true. When a segment is not found to be significant, it moves ahead 0.02 mile. This "not analyzed segments" is analyzed. The question left me confused, it's wrong.	05
18	5/18/00	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	5	4	2	5	5	4	2	4	4	2	Question #9 – If Table C Wet is to be maintained it is important for districts to receive prior to rain season to be ready for wet reviews. October is the latest it should be recieved for a timely review. Yet full data needs to be in the system from previous years, and it seems collision data entry is running a minimum of 6 months behind. Question #6 - The question on"overlap locations" was not clear. I support the identification of "repeat" or "overlap" locations; but not clear what would be the criteria . . .0.1 mile overlap or 0.05 or ?. When would that location be considered a "repeat" and not require review at this time? Question #7 - The only positive I see in not combining adjacent segements, while more work, it does give us an opportunity to identify for the locals where problems are occuring and how often . . . this maybe beneficial in justifying capacity increasing improvements or ITS improvements. It is important to have an on-going program to update traffic volumes on local cross streets for accuracy of significance. I would like to see CHP's use of GIS in the field to accurately identify collision locations. When reviewing traffic collision reports (TCR's) I have seen different officers call the same location very different postmiles, as well as different directions if the roads do not run north/south, east/west. The plot of the collision diagram can look very different if TCR is used rather than Table B information. This discrepancy also alters Table C information, and I fear, may foul the information from future automated collision diagram programs. Thanks for the opportunity to comment . . .	I question the need for a Table C Wet. If collisions occur generaly under wet conditions, the reviewer should hold that review to include a wet review, just as they would a night review, etc., depending upon the pattern. We often will see a Table C All location in September which has wet collisions and hold for a wet review. That location then may be a required location in the Table C wet, and is logged as a repeat location. I feel it would be prefered to have 'criteria' when a location is to be reviewed when wet, rather than a separate Table C.	05
19	5/19/00	2	2	3	2	2	2	1	4	3	3	5	5	5	2	4	4	3			10
20	5/19/00	4	2	2	2	1	2	3	5	4	1	2	2	4	3	2	3	3	CORRECT CODING OF TCR ACCIDENT LOCATIONS		07
21	5/19/00	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	5	3	5	1	5	5	5	5	5			03
22																					
23	5/19/00	1	1	5	5	1	1	1	5	5	1	3	3	3	3	5	5	3	1)Some work groups are misusing significance. Example: 36N 24Y12Y 6N 3N. Instead of using 24 month investigation they use 12 month investigation. This is not a complete investigation and may lead to tort liability. 2)Many investigations are written as "Accidents due to driver error, therefore there is no recommendation for improvement." This is not adaquate justification for no improvement. A better way to present the same example would be, "Field review found that signing, pavement delineation, safety devices and roadway surfaces are all in satisfactory condition. There is no apparent roadway deficiency and the accidents were due to driver errors, therefore there is no recommendation for improvement at this time.	Train on a "think like a motorist" field review. Examples: Can I see it? Did I have time to react to signing or guidance? Was I confused? What is in that dark spot at night, is that my off-ramp? What lane should I be in for my next action? Also train on how to take a good picture presentation. A picture tells a thousand words. How many times do we find ourself going back to the same location to take the one picture we need? Try to make roadway foolproof, try to make it so that even a drunk driver can make it though this segment. In reality we can not prevent drunk driving accidents, however the most clearly marked facility with no confusion will help many of them make it home. And if they do not make it home, lets make the results less servere by minimizing fixed objects and the use of safety hardware.	07
24	5/22/00	2	1	3	3	1	1	2	5	1	5	3	3	3	3	5	5	5	I have worked in traffic a little over twenty (20) years. During that time, table c investigations have been a large part of the workload. I have thought that a complete	I have heard rumors that a certification process maybe initiated for persons working on table c invetigations. Is this true? If yes, I foresee problems occuring if a person does	07

																			study should be conducted to evaluate the table c program to determine if it does correctly identify problems. The study should also analze the correlation between table c investigations and problems that are identified and corrected. I would suggest that with the accident data base we have, the table c program should only compare the section with previous accident data for the same section, not to similar facilities throughout the state. Each freeway and highway has its own individual characteristics. If a safety problem should occur, it should show up by comparison to previous accident data for that section only.	not pass the "test". I wonder what type of questions could be formulated that would be fair to everyone that would test their knowledge and competence. Wouldn't it be more beneficial to have each persons investigations critiqed but not graded. We should be able to learn from mistakes and the experience of others with more knowledge. I have found that tabel c investigating is not an exact science or cookbook type work. Rather it normally requires experience and exposure to others who have the knowledge. It also requires that one ask questions who confronted with problems outside our experience. Thanks for the opportunity to express my opinions.	
25	5/23/00	2	3	3	3	1	2	4	4	5	1	2	4	5	4	4	4	2			11
26	5/23/00	2	2	2	4	1	1	3	5	3	1	3	4	4	2	2	2	3			11
27	5/23/00	3	5	3	1	1	1	3	5	1	3	4	4	4	3	5	4	2	The ability for the program to identify similar types of accidents within the limits of the segment before compiling the number of accidents in a given month. Many times there are not similar patterns and/or causes for the accidents. This leads to conclusions that the highway is operating sufficiently and usually results in non-corrective actions.		09
28	5/24/00	2	1	2	2	2	2	1	5	5	1	4	4	1	3	2	2	2			03
29	5/25/00	1	5	5	5	2	2	1	5	5	1	5	5	5	1	5	5	5	We need to find a way to address the short segments at the end of a highway segment. There is a possibility that we have a concentration at the change between segments but it is not evaluated because the history spans a portion of 2 separate segments.	I do not normally conduct Table C required reviews. My input is based on very little experience with the process. We need better information to understand the criteria used to establish rate groups.	05
30	5/25/00	2	4	5	4	1	1	1	5	1	5	3	5	5	1	2	1	2			07
31	5/26/00	4	2	2	1	1	2	1	4	5	2	1	2	5	5	4	2	1	Too frequently, Table C required locations are being listed where the cause is clearly driver error, mostly DUI(according to accident reports). At many locations the cause is obvious (fog, smoke, dust, or other non-highway deficiency) and can be clearly discerned from the District Office without going to the locations. In larger (by area) districts (such as District 6) driving time to some locations consumes too much PY. We sometimes expend up to 6 to 8 hours to investigate one location where the cause of accidents is well known and is not highway deficiency or design related. Some locations are listed on Table C which have been previously investigated and a fix (if any) has been proposed and approved.		06
32	5/31/00	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	4	1	4	1	2	3	4	4	2			
33	6/1/00	1	1	2	2	2	4	5	5	4	2	2	4	5	2	2	1	1			
34	6/1/00	1	3	3	3	1	1	1	5	5	1	5	5	5	1	4	4	1			
35	6/2/00	1	4	4	5	2	2	1	5	1	3	4	4	4	2	3	5	1			
36	6/2/00	2	1	2	3	1	1	2	4	4	1	4	4	1	3	2	2	1			
37	6/2/00	2	3	4	4	1	2	1	5	2	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	3			
38	6/2/00	1	4	3	4	1	3	2	5	2	1	4	5	5	1	3	3	3			
39	6/2/00	1	1	3	3	1	1	1	5	1	5	5	5	5	1	5	5	1			
40	6/2/00	1	1	2	2	1	2	3	5	3	3	5	5	2	1	3	3	1	I wonder if changing the length of highway segment analysed from 0.2 miles to 0.5 miles and prorating the number of collisions for the 3,6 and 12 month periods likewise would give investigators a broader view of the collision patterns that are occuring on the road. This might tend to give us fewer total locations but give us bigger, more significant safety projects which will help us in reducing the fatal + injury accident rates on each roadway. It may help us develop much larger and more effective projects.	Require all districts to route their proposed Table C investigation locations to Field Maintenance for input prior to field reviewing the location.	
41	6/5/00	3	2	3	2	2	1	3	4	1	3	5	4	5	1	5	3	2			
42	6/5/00	2	4	4	4	1	1	1	5	1	4	4	4	5	2	5	5	4	1. Identifying repeat locations would help decrease the workload of the engineer by doing some of the work he normally is required to do during an HT-65 investigation (looking for "trends"). 2. Platoons of accidents often occur just prior to intersections where drivers are required to make quick decisions, sight distances are sometimes restricted and signs and signals are predominant. These locations should definitely be included in the Table-C program.	For many years it has been difficult for Highway Ops to keep up with the quarterly Table-C workload because of the mirade of other work assigned to us. A semi-annual Table-C schedule might help alleviate this problem without sacrificing safety. Highway safety issues are continually being brought to the attention of Highway Ops by local jurisdictions. I feel this would more than adequately supplement a semi-annual Table-C program to produce a safe environment on our highways for California motorists.	
43	6/5/00	3	4	4	3	1	1	1	5	3	1	1	5	5	2	4	4	4			
44	6/6/00	4	2	4	5	4	2	2	4	4	1	2	2	2	2	5	5	2			

1= Strongly Agree, 2= Agree, 3= No Concern, 4= Disagree, 5= Strongly Disagree